United Nations S/PV.6224

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6224th meeting

Wednesday, 25 November 2009, 11.05 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Mayr-Harting	(Austria)
Members:	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Japan	Mr. Takasu
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Shalgham
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Apakan
	Uganda	Mr. Rugunda
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Parham
	United States of America	Ms. Rice
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its third session (S/2009/444)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

09-61989 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its third session (S/2009/444)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, El Salvador, Finland, India, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Switzerland, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration of the item without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Heraldo Muñoz, Permanent Representative of Chile and Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Muñoz to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2009/444, which contains the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its third session.

At this meeting, the Council will hear a briefing by Mr. Muñoz. I now give the floor to Mr. Muñoz.

Mr. Muñoz: On behalf of the members of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), I am pleased to present the report of the Commission on its third session (S/2009/444).

The annual debates on peacebuilding in the Security Council and the General Assembly provide a platform for reviewing and guiding the work of the Commission by its parent organs. Most importantly, they also allow for broader engagement of the United Nations membership in addressing the critical challenge of post-conflict peacebuilding.

This year, the Security Council and the General Assembly were presented with an additional report by the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). The report, which received significant input from the PBC, highlighted the increasing emphasis that the United Nations is placing on securing a coherent and integrated global response to the challenges in post-conflict situations.

As the Secretary-General mentions in that report, while the United Nations is not the only actor in post-conflict situations, the Organization is increasingly expected to play a leadership role in the field, facilitating engagement between national and international actors, as well as among international actors.

The PBC is the central intergovernmental body of the United Nations that is mandated to ensure that the Organization indeed leads the way towards the alleviation of the suffering of populations in post-conflict situations. Along with the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), the Peacebuilding Commission continues to promote the nexus between security and development and a strategic vision for sustaining and consolidating peace, avoiding relapse into violence and strengthening the rule of law and the respect and promotion of human rights. With its unique membership and its flexible approach to engaging existing and potential actors and partners, the Commission continues to be a viable instrument for improving the United Nations response to the needs and priorities of post-conflict countries.

The report of the PBC on its third session represents a collective effort by the members of its

Organizational Committee to highlight the most important facts and analysis pertinent to the activities undertaken by its various configurations. It also provides observations on the possible way forward. The report reflects the ongoing progress made by the PBC in engaging the countries on its agenda. Moreover, the Commission addressed a number of critical policy questions and lessons learned of particular relevance to its overarching mandate as an institutional mechanism dedicated to addressing the special needs of post-conflict countries.

As indicated in the conclusion of the report on its third session, the Commission has consolidated its core advisory role and demonstrated increasing support for the countries on its agenda. In doing so, the Commission has continued to broaden and deepen its partnerships with critical actors. This is an essential step forward as the Commission strives to ensure the operational relevance of its advice and promote the coherence of peacebuilding strategies.

First and foremost, the PBC continued to strengthen its linkage with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Indeed, during the reporting period, we witnessed an important breakthrough in efforts to deepen the relationship with the Economic and Social Council through the participation of the PBC Chairperson in the Council's 2009 substantive session and an exchange of views with Council members on the important nexus among security, recovery from conflict and development. In addition, the Economic and Social Council and the PBC jointly organized a special event, in collaboration with the World Food Programme, on the food and economic crisis in post-conflict countries. The event was a testimonial to the continued preoccupation of the PBC with the challenge of providing for the basic and economic needs of populations emerging from conflict.

The PBC Chairperson also met with the President of the Security Council on 1 July and participated in the Security Council debate on the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (see S/PV.6165). In addition, the chairs of the four country-specific configurations continued to brief the Security Council regularly on developments in the peacebuilding process in the four countries on the Commission's agenda: Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone.

The PBC also continued to expand partnerships with numerous national, regional and international actors, including United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, international financial institutions, regional organizations, the private sector and civil society.

In mentioning essential partnerships for peacebuilding, I wish to highlight the most recently concluded visit to the African Union headquarters in Addis Ababa, in which I was accompanied by my colleagues, the Vice-Chair, the chairs of the country-specific configurations and the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, and supported by the PBSO and the United Nations Liaison Office to the African Union.

I paid similar outreach visits to the Organization of American States, the international financial institutions headquartered in Washington, D.C., and the European Commission's headquarters in Brussels. These visits contributed to deepening and strengthening dialogue with these key regional and international partners, whose contributions and support to peacebuilding in countries on the Commission's agenda, and globally, are crucial.

With regard to the activities of the various configurations of the PBC, it is important to underscore that the Organizational Committee, representing the core group of PBC members, continued to address possible approaches to enhancing its capacity to implement its core mandates and adapt to prevailing global realities and evolving approaches to critical peacebuilding priorities. To this end, the Committee convened a number of meetings and discussions, which are enumerated in the report.

I wish to underscore the important discussions that the Committee convened on enhancing the capacity of the PBC to fulfil its resource mobilization mandate; employment and income generation, as well as private sector development in post-conflict countries; the implications of the financial crisis on countries emerging from conflict; the United Nations rule of law coordination strategy in countries emerging from conflict; and most recently, the prospects for the mandated 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and for improving engagement with countries seeking the Commission's advice.

In addition, the Chair of the Commission undertook a number of activities to raise global awareness of the challenges facing countries emerging from conflict. To this end, our participation in numerous seminars, workshops, public media interviews and special events served as important platform for advocacy on behalf of the countries on the PBC agenda and of general peacebuilding challenges. Most recently, this activity resulted, among other things, in a unique contribution to the PBF from proceeds of a commemorative digital version of John Lennon and Yoko Ono's classic song "Give Peace a Chance". I encourage all representatives to tell their sons and daughters to download "Give Peace a Chance" from iTunes, and to do so themselves, because the proceeds will go directly to the PBF.

The linkage of United Nations peacebuilding activities to the world of celebrities is deemed to be important in raising awareness and encouraging contributions to noble United Nations causes at the level of the general public. To that end, the PBC is also working on appointing an ambassador for peacebuilding from among a number of possible sports and arts celebrities. In addition, the country-specific configurations continued to lead the design and monitoring of the progress in the implementation of the strategic frameworks for peacebuilding in the four countries on the PBC agenda.

In Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone, the chairs of the four configurations regularly visited the four countries and interacted with high-level national officials, civil society, partners and senior United Nations officials at the country-level. In the four countries, the PBC membership collectively continues to promote inclusiveness and national ownership of the peacebuilding processes. While facing a number of country-specific challenges in the areas of resources, capacity, political commitment and coherence, the Commission provided a viable political platform to address these challenges and seek the partnerships that are needed to help drive the coherence of activities and deliver tangible dividends on the ground.

Finally, the Working Group on Lessons Learned continued to provide an informal platform for the Peacebuilding Commission to draw on the expertise of practitioners from within and outside the United Nations system, as well from countries with certain experience in post-conflict peacebuilding. The Working Group also continued to seek useful ties with the work of the Commission's configurations, the United Nations system and the larger peacebuilding community. To this end, the discussions addressed critical priorities, such as rule of law assistance, sustainable reintegration, regional approaches to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, and the role of national dialogue in peacebuilding.

Throughout its various configurations, the PBC received substantive support from the PBSO. The Office continues to provide an essential linkage to the PBC with the operational entities within and outside the United Nations system. The PBSO continued to give regular quarterly briefings to the Committee on the activities and operations of the PBF. These briefings contributed to deepening the strategic linkage between the Commission and the PBF and provided the Commission with regular opportunities to provide overall policy guidance on the use of the Fund in support of the strategic objectives of peacebuilding in the countries under the PBC's consideration. The synergy between the PBC and the PBF is an area to strengthen even more.

As the United Nations peacebuilding agenda and its ties with other peacebuilding actors expand, the PBSO's scope and areas of support will continue to expand as well. The Office's human and substantive resources will thus need to be further enhanced. The recent appointment by the Secretary-General of Judy Cheng-Hopkins as Assistant Secretary-General and head of the PBSO brings a capable leadership with significant field experience to manage the support provided to the PBC, on the one hand, and the operations of the PBF, on the other.

Three years since the operationalization of the milestone decision of the 2005 World Summit to establish the PBC, PBF and PBSO, the United Nations peacebuilding agenda is expanding in scope and depth. Peacebuilding is an area that may contribute to further defining the image of the Organization in the coming years. The unique feature of peacebuilding as providing the nexus between security, the rule of law and development activities to support laying the foundation for sustainable peace and development is undoubtedly the primary strength behind the concept. At the same time, with multiple actors involved in a range of humanitarian, security and development activities, the challenge of ensuring a coherent and integrated response is daunting. Likewise, the

principles of national ownership and inclusiveness have been pivotal to the work of the Commission during these years.

While we can certainly identify initial progress in linking the advisory role of the PBC with United Nations and non-United Nations operational entities, the PBC remains, in my view, underutilized. The Commission combines a unique link to the three principal organs of the United Nations, a unique composition of membership and a unique degree of flexibility to engage non-United Nations and non-governmental actors.

Therefore, a potential added value of the PBC at the country level is to leverage its weight in order to advance mutual accountability between national actors in the concerned country and its international and regional partners. In particular, the PBC could promote seamless transition from humanitarian to early recovery assistance, synergy between peacekeeping and peacebuilding mandates, and national capacity-development in critical peacebuilding priorities.

As indicated by the Secretary-General in his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), the Peacebuilding Commission has a critical role to play in championing and promoting the agenda outlined in that report. The Commission is certainly positioned to help realize a number of important actions recommended by the Secretary-General in that report. In addition, the envisaged 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions will provide a prime opportunity to further build on the experiences it has gained, define its potential role in support of an expanding United Nations peacebuilding agenda, and enhance its support to countries emerging from conflict.

Finally, in taking the lead on the 2010 review, the Security Council and the General Assembly will be charting an important course for the future relevance of the United Nations in tackling post-conflict situations. This task will be a challenge to our collective capacity to deliver on the promises and ideals of the United Nations Charter, and to respond essentially to the needs of the most vulnerable people of the world.

The President: I thank Ambassador Muñoz for his briefing.

Mr. Parham (United Kingdom): I welcome this debate and am very grateful to Ambassador Muñoz for his briefing.

Better peacebuilding is at the heart of this Council's work. The thematic debate that Uganda, as President of the Council, held in July (see S/PV.6165) highlighted the need for rapid implementation of measures to improve the way we address peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. The debate that we convened when we held the presidency of the Council in August (see S/PV.6178) underlined the need to build much stronger linkages between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Both debates also highlighted the critical role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

The year ahead offers an opportunity for us to address the range of critical gaps that currently hamper our peacebuilding efforts, but let me first commend the work of the Peacebuilding Commission over the past year. I should like to thank Ambassador Muñoz for his dedicated efforts as Chair of the Organizational Committee; the Permanent Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada and Switzerland as chairs of the country-specific configurations; and El Salvador as Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned for their very valuable contributions. I should also like to thank the Peacebuilding Support Office for its support.

The annual report (S/2009/444) describes many of the PBC's achievements, as well as its challenges. If we are to see genuine and sustainable peace take root in countries emerging from conflict, we must build the linkages between mediation, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Where they are deployed, peacekeeping missions have a critical role to play in early peacebuilding by supporting basic safety and security and political processes. They also provide indispensable support to others who deliver the means of economic recovery and basic services, and who help to restore the core functions of Government. This support is essential if political parties, former combatants and the wider population are to invest in peace.

But all too often, we are not seeing enough progress in these keys areas in countries on the Council's agenda. Failures to implement, for example, power-sharing and economic components of a peace agreement, to tackle youth unemployment or to conduct effective security sector reform pose serious threats to peace. This in turn leads to increased

dependency on United Nations or regional peacekeepers. The Secretary-General's peacebuilding report and the New Horizon non-paper issued by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support offer a number of recommendations to help address these gaps. We need now to see rapid progress in implementing them.

The PBC is a key part of this. It can provide a platform for bringing together political, security, humanitarian and development components of the international response to ensure that they are mobilized behind a single strategy in support of national efforts. There are too many examples of disparate and fragmented action by the international community in security sector reform, the rule of law and in other areas. The PBC should help forge mutual commitments between a Government and its partners for the implementation of agreed priorities and should regularly monitor their delivery.

The PBC has a particular responsibility to reach out to the development community and to secure its early and sustained attention in these complex and high-risk environments. That includes ensuring much better communication with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and regional development banks.

We need to examine when is the optimal time for a country to be referred to the PBC. We should be looking at earlier referrals while peacekeepers are still deployed, and the PBC should explore more flexible approaches to its engagement. It should not get bogged down in elaborating detailed strategies, but make use of existing plans and rapidly identify practical steps to address peacebuilding priorities. We need to shift its focus from New York to country-level action and ensure that it has a more distinctive role and voice.

A measure of confidence in the PBC will be the number of countries referred to it and their profile and complexity. We need to understand the incentives and disincentives for a country coming onto the PBC's agenda, and the Council needs to be more proactive in assessing which countries, if interested, might benefit from PBC assistance. We also need to improve the way in which advice generated by the PBC informs decisions of this Council.

The PBC review next year offers a critical opportunity to take stock of achievements to date and to increase the PBC's added value. To generate real progress, it is important that the Council take its parental responsibilities seriously and, together with the General Assembly, make full use of the review to make the PBC more effective in delivering its ultimate goal — preventing countries from falling back into conflict.

That will be the test of the PBC's worth. That will be the test of this Council's development and use of the PBC in partnership with the General Assembly. That will be the measure of our efforts in the eyes of the millions of men, women and children whose lives will otherwise continue to be ravaged by the appalling consequences of conflict.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): Let me start by thanking Ambassador Muñoz for his dedication to the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) during his tenure as Chair, and express further appreciation to the Chairs of the PBC's country-specific configurations for their committed efforts.

The United States welcomes the third annual report of the PBC (S/2009/444). We are glad to have this opportunity to reflect on past achievements and future challenges as we near the fifth anniversary of the Commission's establishment.

The United States was an early supporter of the Peacebuilding Commission. In 2005, we looked at a 15-year track record of international response to armed conflict and we saw major gaps. We saw peace processes at risk, not only because of the inherent fragility of post-conflict transitions, but also because many of our diplomatic, security, humanitarian and development tools were not well suited to the task at hand, or sometimes even worked at cross-purposes. We saw a rate of relapse into conflict that was unacceptably high. We saw development jeopardized across the board. We saw that a third of the people living in extreme poverty were from conflict-affected States, and we knew that we must have been doing something wrong. We saw that as unacceptable. However, we were also convinced that it was and is remediable. The Peacebuilding Commission, we believed, could be a crucial new instrument to help us collectively change course.

The PBC is still a young institution trying to deliver on these expectations. The United States very much appreciates the PBC's growing track record, including its efforts to institute more flexible methods of work, its success in mobilizing resources from

traditional and non-traditional donors, its commitment to nationally driven peacebuilding strategies and its work facilitating coordination among all stakeholders in order to have a more concrete impact.

The third annual report documents some of these notable achievements. In Burundi, the PBC added its voice to those of regional institutions and others to help create conditions to resume the political process. In Sierra Leone, the PBC helped to broaden the donor base. In Guinea-Bissau, the PBC supported the organization of legislative elections and helped to secure crucially needed funding. In the Central African Republic, the PBC supported the national dialogue and has helped to enhance prospects for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. My Government also welcomes the revised terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund, which will give the Fund the potential to be much more responsive to urgent needs.

As we approach the PBC's five-year mark, we have the opportunity to take stock and look to the Commission's future. We believe that the PBC has the potential to be an important instrument for mobilizing our best collective efforts and helping us to focus on the most pressing requirements to keep conflict from reigniting: helping Governments restart critical services, generating jobs and reviving economies, restoring the rule of law, reforming the security sector, tackling crime and transborder causes of instability, and putting an end to sexual and gender-based violence. Whether in the PBC or not, these issues are among the highest on the agenda of the United States and on our shared agenda here at the United Nations. We urgently need to strengthen our ways of working together to address them.

We are committed to a serious and ambitious review. We believe that we need to approach the process with open minds and a practical commitment to frank dialogue about the PBC's added value and how to strengthen its role and impact. That includes looking candidly at our own performance here in the Security Council where, as we noted in July, we need to do more to take earlier account of the peacebuilding components of peace processes.

The past 20 years have brought tremendous learning and experience in the peacebuilding field — expertise that the review will need to tap. The review should engage key stakeholders, especially regional organizations and actors, international financial institutions and development banks, troop- and police-contributing countries, donors, the private sector, academics and civil society. Of course, it will also need to draw on the insights of the PBC's members, especially its country-specific configurations, and we will look to the Secretary-General's personal leadership to mobilize ideas and expertise from across the United Nations system. Most of all, the review should be informed by the views and experiences of post-conflict countries, both on and off the PBC's agenda. Whether the PBC has something real and lasting to offer them is the ultimate test of its success.

Let me offer two observations in closing. First, my Government would like to underscore the importance of timely follow-up to the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). We look forward to progress in clarifying key peacebuilding roles and responsibilities, which will enable the United Nations system to build centres of excellence in critical areas. We also welcome steady progress in the effort to meet the so-called civilian capacity gap, with particular attention to mobilizing talent and expertise from developing countries. Deeper reflection on the links among integrated peacebuilding missions, the civilian components of peacekeeping operations and the related activities of United Nations agencies can help to ensure that core civilian functions are filled in the most effective way.

Secondly, we would also underscore the value we see in working to forge greater coherence among United Nations peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts. Throughout the past year, we have engaged in a deepening conversation about how to strengthen peacekeeping. As we look to future deliberations, both on peacekeeping and the PBC review, we see an important opportunity to forge a closer and more dynamic link between these interrelated efforts.

The PBC was created because of gaps in international response that left too many countries vulnerable to violent relapse. The PBC has helped to shrink some of these gaps, but many remain. The challenge we all face today is to redouble our efforts to close those gaps.

Mr. Puente (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by expressing my delegation's gratitude to Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz for his leadership and

distinguished work at the head of the Peacebuilding Commission. We would also like to commend the extremely valuable and devoted work of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and of the Working Group on Lessons Learned.

The valuable experience acquired by the Commission in implementing the Strategic Frameworks for Peacebuilding in Sierra Leone, Burundi, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic in the areas of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, rule of law assistance, security sector reform and the promotion of development must be viewed as a point of departure for defining the future work of the Commission, improving its advisory role and mobilization of resources, and underpinning peacebuilding processes in the countries on its agenda.

Three years after its establishment, the Commission has evolved continuously as it has faced challenges arising from the particular situations in the countries on its agenda. We therefore believe that its mechanisms must be adapted still further in order to enhance its contribution to peacebuilding initiatives and prepare a more rapid and effective response in the immediate aftermath of conflict. Our final objective must be to ensure that the dividends of peace become a reality for the societies involved and are relevant to their socio-economic development needs.

Given the fact that the Commission is a new body that has not yet reached its full potential, it is important to support, as noted in the Commission's report on its third session (S/2009/444), the strengthening of its working methods and its ability to improve the quality and efficiency of its mandate, promoting action in such areas as tailoring its response to situations in the field, harmonizing the work of the various country-specific configurations, strengthening and diversifying the mobilization of resources, and extending in-country visits in order to raise public awareness of the processes under way.

There is still much potential for the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat to avail themselves more proactively of the advice provided by the Peacebuilding Commission and, in the interest of coherence, to seek coordination with other bodies outside the United Nations system, including local and regional actors, in order to promote and implement peacebuilding strategies that contribute to the revitalization of State institutions and their ability to respond effectively to the needs of the people.

My delegation firmly believes that the Commission, as a pillar of the peacebuilding architecture, can play an even more decisive role in post-conflict prevention and reconstruction processes. We therefore reaffirm our commitment to the presidential statements adopted recently by the Security Council on this matter (S/PRST/2009/23 and S/PRST/2009/24), which reflect the importance of coherence and integration among peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development activities.

We also believe it vital for the Commission to strive still further, together with the other protagonists involved, to implement the strategy proposed by the Secretary-General in his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) to guide peacebuilding activities in five fundamental spheres: security, support for the political process, the provision of basic services, the re-establishment of institutions and economic revitalization.

Since its establishment, my delegation has recognized in the Commission and its noble mandate a tool that should be developed with the aim of identifying a consistent and comprehensive focus on the promotion of and support for reconstruction efforts in the immediate aftermath of conflict. Since its creation, we have been aware of its potential to enhance the United Nations peacebuilding response, as we have stated in the Security Council and the General Assembly when we have addressed this matter.

To conclude, Mexico trusts that the review of the founding resolutions of the Commission, scheduled for 2010, will be seized as a window of opportunity to analyse the way in which the United Nations and the international community can improve our action and interaction to strengthen national capacities in post-conflict reconstruction.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): We would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate, to which Croatia attaches great importance. We also recognize the important role that the Peacebuilding Support Office has to play in our deliberations.

Croatia aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the Swedish presidency of the European Union later in our debate, and we also thank the

Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) under the capable leadership of its Chair, Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, for the comprehensive report on the respective areas of its competence (S/2009/444).

In light of the increasing complexity of conflicts and their aftermaths, as well as of new emerging challenges to peacebuilding efforts, focus on this topic not only deserves the sustained attention of the Security Council, but also needs to be approached in a coherent and coordinated manner. Therefore, we particularly welcome its commensurate review by the Security Council in the wake of the recent General Assembly debate. It is the firm belief of Croatia that, besides conflict prevention and peace-related activities undertaken during a conflict, peacebuilding is a key element of peace operations, whose ultimate objective is the establishment of self-sustainable security and prosperity for affected populations.

As the Secretary-General has pointed out, countries in post-conflict situations are, as a rule, fragile and can over time re-enter the spiral of violence. That is why utmost attention needs to be invested in building solid foundations to establish sustainable peace. For Croatia, the cornerstone of international peacebuilding efforts continues to be found in the United Nations architecture, notably the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund, which together represent the core mechanisms to guide future peacebuilding and development efforts. Furthermore, they have proved to be important conduits for enhancing the coordination and coherence of international support to the peace-consolidation efforts of countries.

In taking stock of respective PBC mandates over the past three years, it is appropriate that we recognize notable outcomes in its third year of operation. As the principal organ for maintaining peace and security, the Security Council should consider how to further advance the peacebuilding agenda in the United Nations and beyond so that, collectively, the international community can effectively support countries emerging from conflict as they advance on the path towards sustainable peace, reconstruction, economic recovery and development.

There needs to be a recognition that peacebuilding efforts are highly complex and that a plethora of actors is often operating at any one time, notwithstanding the leadership role played by the United Nations and its personnel in the field. Every effort must be made to coordinate the activities of these actors and others operating in the theatre so as to avoid duplication or blurring and to achieve a synergy of efforts. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) itself notes that the existence of a single peacebuilding strategy, developed through a consultative process of all relevant partners on the ground, will significantly help to facilitate coordination efforts.

It is our view that the United Nations should continue to play the role of umbrella organization, providing the groundwork for various organizations to meet, discuss and coordinate plans and projects, while similarly respecting their independence and their own approaches and responsibilities. It has been our conviction that the establishment of a system of feedback and lessons learned, whereby present activities will be inspired by the effects of those undertaken in the past, would provide the best way forward, and it is for that reason that we welcome the work being done by the PBC's Working Group on Lessons Learned. We are especially supportive of its focus on key lessons learned by experts on their respective issues — for example, rule of law issues, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, developing national capacities and coordinating PBC efforts with regional and subregional organizations.

National ownership must also be a central tenet of any peacekeeping effort. Our own experiences from the 1990s have demonstrated that, despite the altruistic goals set by United Nations missions and agencies in the field, external actors are often unable to fully comprehend the real needs of a domestic population. In other words, external actors are often ill-equipped to rebuild the institutions of a war-torn State by themselves. National actors need to be a part of the earned peace dividend. International support should build on existing structures and capacities.

Croatia would like to reiterate its support for the Secretary-General's report and his recommendations to strengthen peacebuilding efforts. We welcome the improved interaction between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council, although it should be noted that there is still room for improvement to ensure a natural progression from peacekeeping to peacebuilding. We would like to stress that, in its presidential statement of 5 August 2009 (S/PRST/2009/24) the Council itself re-emphasized the

need for coherence between, and integration of, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development. It also pointed out the need for progress in achieving a coordinated United Nations approach in-country in order to address, among other things, the critical gaps in achieving peacebuilding objectives.

Before I conclude, allow me to touch upon the issue of challenges in financing peacebuilding efforts, especially as in times of global financial constraints the effects of crises are most exacerbated in areas of vulnerability. It is therefore understandable that successful peacebuilding efforts require predictable, sustained and well-coordinated funding. As stated by the Secretary-General, funding for peacebuilding should be seen as an early investment in sustainable peace and development. As the Peacebuilding Fund can only provide a limited share of the resources required, we support the efforts of the Peacebuilding Commission to engage other non-traditional donors and partners, such as diasporas and private foundations. For their part, donor mechanisms need to be more adaptable to changing needs on the ground. We also look to other quick-response mechanisms, such as the Central Emergency Response Fund, which has been very successful in the four years since its inception.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): First of all, we would like to express our appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Chile, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, as well as to the Chairmen of its country-specific configurations, namely, the Permanent Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada and Switzerland, for their efforts to strengthen the role of the Commission in the United Nations system and beyond. We are also grateful for the Commission's report on the work of its third session (S/2009/444). We share its conclusions and recommendations.

We have positively evaluated the results of the Commission's third year of work. The Commission has done serious work in its country-specific configurations. It has built up important experience, including in terms of establishing regular dialogue between the Commission and the Security Council on specific countries. We note that the mandates of United Nations configuration offices in Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone and the Central African Republic call for assistance in implementing the peacebuilding frameworks developed by the Commission with the direct participation of the Governments of those countries. Given the role of the configuration heads as Resident Coordinators, we believe that we can achieve significant progress in genuinely coordinating peacebuilding efforts in the field — for example, through the practical interaction between the Security Council and the Commission. The great virtue of the Commission lies in its ability to establish direct dialogue with national Governments and ensure their leading role and responsibility for the peacebuilding process.

In a year's time, as called for in the relevant resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly, we will carry out a review of the Commission's work. In our view, that review should be conducted on the basis of the following elements: strict observance of the Charter-enshrined principles governing the relations between major United Nations bodies on the basis of their relevant duties and functions, and full consideration of practical experience gained through the work of the Commission for the purpose of consolidating the accumulation of positive results. The review will probably touch on a wide range of issues, such as the links between peacemaking, peacebuilding and sustainable development and the coordination of peacebuilding efforts inside the United Nations and beyond.

We believe that one of the major tasks is to harmonize the agreed functions of the Commission with the mechanisms at its disposal. We reiterate our willingness to support a reasonable and realistic proposal aimed at increasing the authority of the Commission and strengthening the central principle of peacebuilding efforts, namely, national responsibility. The review should result in further strengthening of the advisory role of the Commission, increasing its effectiveness in resolving problems associated with coordinating international efforts, developing recommendations on political stabilization, improving security conditions, restoring Statehood and promoting economic stability and the development of countries that have experienced severe crises.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I would like once again to commend your leadership, Mr. President, as well as to thank you for organizing this very important debate to consider the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on the work of its third session (S/2009/444). I would also like to thank Ambassador Muñoz, Chairman of the Peacebuilding

Commission (PBC), who has just introduced the report. We congratulate him and commend the Chairpersons of the PBC's various country-specific configurations for their unwavering commitment and determination when it comes to peacebuilding in countries emerging from conflict.

This morning's debate is a very timely one, for it serves to make the efforts of the Commission more visible and, in particular, to make it possible to assume new commitments and respond adequately and effectively to the needs of countries emerging from conflict. We would especially like to commend the efforts made both by the Organizational Committee and the country-specific configurations of the PBC to improve their working methods and procedures and, in so doing, facilitating greater interaction among its members and the countries on the Commission's agenda.

It is clear that no peacebuilding process can be successful without, first and foremost, involving national stakeholders and having greater awareness of the priorities of the countries concerned. It is therefore reassuring that the Commission, through its various country-specific configurations, has incorporated the strategic approach and is drawing on experience and good practices.

Although much still remains to be done, some of the initiatives and positive actions undertaken by the Commission certainly merit attention, for they take into account many of the considerations and recommendations that have been made, in particular with regard to enhancing the Commission's role in mobilizing resources from both traditional and non-traditional partners; promoting ownership of the peacebuilding process by national stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector and involving regional and subregional actors; planning and coordinating the efforts of all stakeholders in order to avoid duplication of effort; and strengthening partnerships with bodies of the United Nations system and with bilateral and multilateral partners, in particular regional and subregional organizations and international financial institutions.

The compelling nature of some of the challenges that countries face in the aftermath of conflict requires urgent support from the international community in order to avoid the resumption of hostilities. In that regard, we welcome the invaluable financial contribution of the Peacebuilding Fund. In that connection, it is essential that efforts continue to be made to ensure the effective implementation of the Fund's guiding principles, namely with regard to transparency, flexibility, speed and ownership of programmes by beneficiary countries. We believe that the Peacebuilding Fund's revised mandate should make it possible for it to be more effective and responsive, to the benefit of post-conflict countries. When it comes to strengthening the partnerships between the Commission and other stakeholders, we absolutely must take into account those regional and subregional actors, such as the African Union, who play a significant role in peacebuilding.

Given the indispensable role played by the Peacebuilding Commission, it is incumbent on us to furnish it with the appropriate resources in a reliable way. We wish to commend, in particular, its role as an advocate in mobilizing international support for countries emerging from conflict. The strategic partnerships and arrangements it is developing with certain institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, are to be welcomed, as they provide additional operational know-how and resources for responding to the priorities of countries emerging from conflict. Those efforts must be continued and working methods and mechanisms adapted to respond adequately and effectively to the needs of countries emerging from conflict.

We also wish to take this opportunity to commend the work done by the Peacebuilding Support Office in support of the joint efforts undertaken through the Commission. We remain convinced that the commitment shown by all United Nations organs as well as the international community and the continuation of their efforts will make it possible to carry out peacebuilding processes that are more reliable and can lead to effective peace and lasting development in countries emerging from conflict.

In conclusion, we await with interest the recommendations that will accompany the outcome of the review in 2010 of the resolutions that established the Commission. We believe that that report will give us an opportunity, by drawing on experience and lessons learned, to strengthen the Commission's support to countries emerging from conflict.

Mr. Shalgham (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like at the outset to express our

appreciation to you, Mr. President, for having organized this debate on the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I should like to extend my thanks to the Commission for its third annual report (S/2009/444). We also extend our thanks to His Excellency Ambassador Muñoz, the Permanent Representative of Chile and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, and to the current and former Chairs of the four country-specific configurations for their distinguished efforts in guiding the work of the Commission and its configurations.

We appreciate this debate, as well as that which took place in the General Assembly recently, as important opportunities to assess the progress achieved by the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund in carrying out their mandates to consolidate peace in post-conflict countries. We should also like to express our appreciation of the efforts exerted by the Commission and its country-specific configurations to increase international interest in and commitment to the mobilization of resources, so as to put the strategic plans and frameworks agreed upon into effect with the countries on the agenda of the Commission. Libya reaffirms its support for the stance of the Non-Aligned Movement in this respect.

We express our high appreciation for the efforts exerted by the Peacebuilding Commission to collaborate effectively with other bodies of the United Nations, such as the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and we emphasize the importance of continuing such interaction and fostering further coordination and cooperation between the Peacebuilding Commission and other regional and subregional organizations, including the African Union (AU). In this respect, we commend the recent successful visit by a delegation of the Peacebuilding Commission, chaired by Ambassador Muñoz, the Permanent Representative of Chile, to the AU headquarters in Addis Ababa. We call for such visits and meetings to be continued, with a view to creating a common strategic understanding of the priorities for peacebuilding in post-conflict countries and to specify a more effective methodology for tackling the current challenges we face in this respect.

Libya commends increased efforts and interest in peacebuilding and the greater interaction between the Peacebuilding Commission, other bodies of the United Nations and other regional and international organizations, which in itself reflects the importance of expanding the membership in the Peacebuilding Commission. This is a request that has been made repeatedly by the Non-Aligned Movement. We are confident that this would enhance the effectiveness of peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict countries and that the Commission would benefit from the various experiences that we have accumulated in this respect.

Peacebuilding is a multidimensional process involving a number of challenges. Among these, we believe, is the challenge of how to strategically link the social, economic, developmental, political and security elements and priorities of peacebuilding. We believe that peacebuilding efforts will never bear fruit if we focus on certain elements and priorities and ignore others, especially with regards to the priorities of economic recovery and development. We therefore call for the developmental aspect of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission to be further enhanced.

We agree with the remarks and conclusions mentioned in the report of the Peacebuilding Commission, especially those relating to coordination, coherence and partnerships with a view to developing integrated peacebuilding strategies based on the fundamental principles of national ownership, mutual accountability and continued partnership. There has to be greater contact, awareness and information on the role of the Commission, especially with regard to the countries on its agenda.

With regard to the mobilization of resources, undoubtedly financing constitutes a fundamental aspect for maintaining the momentum of peacebuilding. In this regard, we should like to stress the importance of confirming the conviction contained in paragraph 79 of the Commission's report, which states that "rapid and flexible funding, aligned to an agreed and prioritized strategy, is critical for successful peacebuilding". Peacebuilding funding must be viewed as an early investment in peace and development, and this requires taking greater risks, beyond regular financing for development. And, in this respect, we call for the revised competencies of the Peacebuilding Fund to be swiftly applied, so as to enable the Fund to act as a tool that provides swift and flexible financing and effective response to peacebuilding efforts.

Through its membership in the country-specific configuration for the Central African Republic, Libya is well aware of the importance of making strenuous efforts to build peace in a country whose people long

to live in peace and to enjoy sustainable development and prosperity, especially in view of the broad momentum produced by the political dialogue and comprehensive agreements, in whose successful outcome Libya has participated.

In addition to the commitment expressed by the Government of the Central African Republic and the local, regional and international stakeholders, those developments deserve to be encouraged through tireless efforts to build peace in that country. That is what we are striving for, as well as for other efforts on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and Burundi. We hope that the forthcoming visit of the delegation of the country-specific configuration for the Central African Republic, to be led by Ambassador Grauls, the Permanent Representative of Belgium, will be successful. We are confident in Belgium's leadership and commitment to achieving peace.

We look forward to a comprehensive review of peacebuilding activities in the coming year, which will help bridge the existing gap, and we trust that preparations for such a review will start soon.

Mr. Takasu (Japan): I too would like to thank Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz for his presentation of the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2009/444).

I am very pleased that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has continued to make steady progress during its third year. Under the able leadership of Chairman Muñoz the PBC has deepened its partnership with many organizations outside the United Nations, such as the World Bank, the European Union and the African Union, in particular. Each of the four country-specific configurations advanced peacebuilding efforts, yielding good results on the ground. For example, the Sierra Leone country-specific configuration organized a special session in June to help mobilize resources for that country's new development plan. In the Central African Republic the first strategic framework has been adopted, focusing on the areas of security and development.

It is gratifying that the PBC is a success story of United Nations reform. Its work is going very well, and it has established itself as a reliable body and partner to support countries in post-conflict recovery, linking security and development in an integrated manner. It enjoys the continued support of Member States and international organizations. The Commission's strength derives largely from the personal commitment and engagement of the members of the Commission itself. We therefore applaud the dedication and commitment of the various chairs: the Permanent Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, of course, El Salvador and Switzerland. We are very grateful to all the ambassadors for their work.

The Peacebuilding Fund is also becoming an essential tool for countries emerging from conflict. I hope the Fund will play a catalytic and strategic role to attract multiplying resources for peacebuilding.

The Secretary-General's July report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) addressed the challenges of recovery at the very beginning of the post-conflict stage. It complements the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund. I commend the Secretariat's efforts to implement the recommendations contained in the report and look forward to regular updates on its progress.

The year 2010 will be critical for the Peacebuilding Commission, as it will undergo its five-year review, as envisaged in the original founding resolutions (Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) and General Assembly resolution 60/180). I would like to cite four points I consider essential, particularly in connection with the work of the Security Council — and, of course, they would be useful input for the General Assembly, too, but I would like to emphasize these four points from the Council's point of view.

First, the review should focus on increasing the effectiveness of the Peacebuilding Commission in achieving positive results and concrete outcomes on the ground. It is important to reflect on the good practices of the past three years and to maximize their strengths and added value to mobilize non-traditional political and financial support.

Secondly, the Security Council should increase its substantive interaction with the Peacebuilding Commission. Regular consultations between the Chair of the PBC and the President of the Council, and now briefings by the country-specific configuration Chairs at the Council's relevant meetings, are now established practice. But we should probably do more. I believe the Security Council should make better use of the PBC's capacity and potential as its advisory body. For instance, the Council could ask the Commission to

examine in depth some specific issues that the Council has been struggling with but cannot fully address due to time constraints — such as security sector reform, electoral assistance and job creation for youths after conflicts — and report back to the Council with findings and recommendations.

Thirdly, the Security Council should begin considering adding new countries to the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda. It has four countries now, but as it makes progress in its work and the workload for some country-specific configurations is gradually reduced and could be streamlined, the Commission will have capacity to take on additional countries, even in parts of the world beyond Africa. The Council might also consider asking the Commission to deal with certain peacebuilding issues that are a priority for a particular country, instead of what has been the practice up to now of covering a country's entire range of challenges. In doing so, the Commission might be able to play a role more strategically complementary to the Council.

Fourthly, we should play close attention to the relationship between the needs of peacekeeping and of peacebuilding. The requirements of both are fully country-overlapping and complement each other. Overlapping is not a bad thing; it is good, because in recent years, the mandates of peacekeeping operations increasingly include peacebuilding tasks such as security sector reform, democratic governance, electoral support, enhancing the rule of law, and capacity-building.

Obviously the PBC does not need to be engaged in every activity of that nature, but successful peacebuilding efforts are essential to regulate the strategy of peacekeeping operations smoothly. The Commission can take charge of a country once the main focus shifts from security to stability and development. We need to develop a coherent strategy to bridge gaps between peacekeeping, early recovery and nation-building.

Lastly, with regard to the review of the Peacebuilding Commission, it may be useful for the Council, as one of its founding organs, to organize an Arria Formula meeting bringing in the perspectives of experts and interested parties to enrich our work. It might also be appropriate to nominate a facilitator to guide the Commission's review process, someone with extensive knowledge of peacebuilding and capable of forging consensus in this area. As a peace-fostering nation, Japan is committed to contributing proactively to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and to its review process.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): We too wish to thank the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz of Chile for his in-depth briefing on the related activities of the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund during the period under review.

The overriding purpose of Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) is to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to prevent conflicts and to assist countries emerging from armed conflict in their efforts towards sustained recovery, reconstruction and development.

In that connection, the Vietnamese delegation wishes to underscore that, in its initial years of evolution, the PBC has consolidated its core advisory role and leant significant support to critical peacebuilding priorities. The Commission has made strong efforts to enhance public awareness and outreach, capacity-building and policy guidance. It has also strengthened the common platform for closer and more effective cooperation among the relevant United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, as well as among regional and subregional organizations. A more notable strength of the Commission is its capacity to help initiate funding for the countries on its agenda to respond to emergency financial difficulties.

Viet Nam commends the Commission's work in its third year of development. The PBC, through its country-specific configurations and integrated peacebuilding strategies, has yielded concrete and important results under challenging circumstances in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone. Sierra Leone and Burundi, the first two countries on the Commission's agenda, have surely recorded real progress in consolidating peace, while Burundi has made headway in its peace process through the inclusive political dialogues. Sierra Leone, for its part, has now emerged as a country firmly on the path towards stability and development, with significant reforms having been undertaken in the socio-economic and security sectors.

Three years after the establishment of the PBC, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office, in accordance with the 2005 World Summit

Outcome (resolution 60/1), peacebuilding is steadily expanding in scope and depth. With its comparative advantages residing in its unique representative membership and convening power for various actors and stakeholders, the Commission has become a viable institution for promoting the nexus between security and development, as well as a strategic vision for consolidating peace and avoiding relapses into violence in post-conflict countries.

There remain, however, a number of persistent challenges to the Commission in its activities. These challenges range from supporting political processes and reconciliation to sustaining safety and security, and from strengthening the rule of law to facilitating the provision of basic services and the revitalization of economies destroyed by armed conflict and war.

In all these areas, more tangible and measurable results continue to be a central element of all its work on the ground. The Commission will be more effective in furthering the international peacebuilding agenda if its activities are better tailored to the needs and priorities of recipient countries. To this effect, the PBC should redouble its efforts to improve its rules of procedures and working methods, intensify interaction with countries on its agenda, and rationalize its institutional relationships with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with the respective competence of each body as defined by the Charter.

In view of the aftermath of the global economic and financial crisis, the Peacebuilding Fund should build upon its revised terms of reference and truly serve as a catalytic, responsive and focused resource for peacebuilding support. Overall, the efficient functioning of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture rests upon the capacity to deliver a real impact on the ground.

At the same time, bringing to bear the full force of the United Nations system in support of a country emerging from conflict requires unity of purpose and action in all areas of peace and security, human rights, the rule of law, development and humanitarian affairs, as well as coherence among preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Greater emphasis on education and training, job creation, agriculture, infrastructure, private sector reform and other development agendas can ultimately address the root causes of conflicts and break the vicious cycle of poverty, marginalization and violence.

The upcoming 2010 review process will be a good opportunity to take stock of achievements, gaps and impact in the exercise of the Commission's core mandates. It will also be a good opportunity for the PBC to build on lessons learned and experiences to date so as to help the Commission better adapt to prevailing global realities and better support the countries that are or will be on its agenda.

Mr. De Rivière (France) (*spoke in French*): France commends the organization of this debate, held a few months before the fifth anniversary of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). It is an opportunity to underscore the initial gains of the PBC and to focus on priority efforts that could improve the effectiveness of its work. The 2010 review should allow the Commission to become an influential tool that will bring added value to key areas of peacebuilding.

We fully align ourselves with the statement to be made by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union.

I also wish to thank Ambassador Muñoz, Chair of the Commission, for his dedication and his work at the head of the PBC since January 2009. France also wishes to express its gratitude to the four Chairs of the country-specific configurations engaged in resolute peacebuilding efforts in the countries in question.

As its report (S/2009/444) indicates, the PBC has already achieved satisfactory results in the four countries on its agenda. For four years, the Commission has played a growing role in its United Nations peacebuilding efforts in countries that are just emerging from conflict, by mobilizing resources and coordinating international assistance. My delegation emphasizes the importance of the ties that have been established between the PBC and the national authorities of those four States, in particular in the definition of strategic priorities. The ownership of those peacebuilding strategies by all stakeholders is vital. We therefore call on the Governments of Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic, which have the primary responsibility for successful peacebuilding, to pursue their cooperation with the Commission, in particular in completing the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes under way, reforming their security sectors and organizing elections.

Despite that progress, we feel that the Commission's effectiveness can still be improved. The Commission has not yet achieved all the objectives entrusted to it when it was created. France favours strengthened relations between the Commission and the Security Council, as suggested by the Secretary-General in his June report (S/2009/304). The primary objective of the Commission is to ensure the transition between peacekeeping operations and the peacebuilding process. To that end, the Commission and the Council must cooperate more regularly and more closely to ensure, in particular, that the peacebuilding dimension is taken into account at the earliest possible phase in defining post-crisis strategies.

The effectiveness of the Commission also depends on its relations with the United Nations system, in particular the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Increased synergy with those organs will ensure the coordination of actions conducive to the establishment of lasting peace in the political, economic and social spheres. We also call on all Member States to pay particular attention to the work of the Commission and to support it.

The main contribution of the Commission is to mobilize energies and resources while coordinating activities on the ground, including the work of international financial institutions, United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations with which the PBC is in ongoing contact. In that regard, it is vital that the Commission follow up on projects financed by the Peacebuilding Fund in order to ensure the coherence of the international community's financial assistance. Thus, the Commission's value added could lie in the coordinated selection of projects and of the States that are recipients of funds through the Peacebuilding Fund.

The Commission should review some of its working methods and step up its efforts on the ground. The Commission's presence on the ground in the form of a PBC focal point, through a United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office, is a prerequisite for coordinating international efforts and for ensuring the credibility of the Commission. The Integrated Peacebuilding Offices should serve as effective day-to-day intermediaries in the implementation of approaches jointly defined by the Commission and the State in question.

Finally, I welcome the role played by the Peacebuilding Support Office in supporting the activities of the Commission. I wish great success to Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, who recently took up her post.

In our view, the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission will be a critical milestone in enabling the Commission to enhance its effectiveness and to gain visibility and influence here in New York and, most especially, on the ground. The in-depth and objective review should provide a comprehensive view of its strengths and weaknesses of the Commission's activities, with a view to making it more effective.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation thanks the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for report on its third session (S/2009/444). Our thanks go to Ambassador Muñoz, Chairman of the Commission, for his briefing; we appreciate his hard work over the past year.

Last week the General Assembly considered the report of the PBC. The broader membership of the United Nations offered a positive assessment of the Commission's work over the past year. At the same time, members expressed their views on the 2010 review of the work of the PBC, including on the need, inter alia, to consider the linkage between peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding operations in an integrated manner, to strengthen the coordination of the PBC with other United Nations bodies and agencies, to further enhance the Commission's fundraising capacity and to expedite the disbursement of funds by the Peacebuilding Fund. We hope that the PBC will seriously consider and incorporate those rational proposals.

I wish to make a number of points about the future work of the PBC. First, the Commission needs to optimize its relations with other United Nations bodies and agencies. Within the United Nations, the PBC should enhance its interaction with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. System-wide, the Commission should further strengthen its communication and coordination with the relevant specialized agencies, funds and programmes; this should be extended also to regional organizations with a view to establishing a peacebuilding support and funding network. On the ground, the PBC should make full use of the resources

of United Nations projects, funds and peacekeeping missions, so as to avoid redundancy and waste.

Secondly, the PBC should enhance its partnerships with recipient countries. Recipient countries bear primary responsibility for their own peacebuilding efforts. Recipient countries should have adequate say in identifying peacebuilding priorities. In implementing peaceful reconstruction strategies, the PBC should pay greater attention to training human resources and building the capacities of recipient countries. It should make full use of recipient countries' existing human resources and expertise.

Thirdly, the PBC should take the opportunity afforded by the 2010 comprehensive review and continue to work towards completing its institution-building. The Commission is expected to streamline its meetings, improve its efficiency and ensure the quality of its meetings. It is our hope that, as it identifies peacebuilding priorities — beyond security sector reform, human rights and the rule of law in recipient countries — the Commission will pay more attention to deeply rooted problems that are the cause of conflict, including problems related to economic and social development.

Sierra Leone, Burundi, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic are the PBC's country-specific focus. They are also on the agenda of the Security Council. Close cooperation between the Council and the PBC is therefore crucial in consolidating the peace processes of those countries. Links between the two bodies should be strengthened. The Security Council can provide the Peacebuilding Commission with guidance through formal meetings, informal consultations and other modalities. In handling relevant issues, the Council should, to the extent possible, take on board the professional suggestions made by the PBC. Moreover, in the light of conditions in particular countries, the Council should consider referring new countries for PBC consideration.

Mr. Rugunda (Uganda): I wish to thank Ambassador Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for presenting the report of the PBC (S/2009/444) and for his outstanding leadership of the Commission. We commend him and we commend the respective Chairs of the country-specific configurations and of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, as well as the Peacebuilding Support Office, for their good work and their achievements during the reporting period.

The Peacebuilding Commission is playing an important role in promoting and supporting an integrated and coherent approach to peacebuilding. We are convinced that greater priority and more resources should be devoted to peacebuilding. It is the foundation for sustainable security, stability, economic growth and development in post-conflict situations. As we pointed out during the thematic debate on post-conflict peacebuilding in July (see S/PV.6165), the United Nations system and the wider international community need to put greater focus on ensuring better coherence in conflict-prevention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development.

Uganda welcomes the PBC's increasing engagement with countries on its agenda, through facilitating strategic coordination and the alignment of political and financial support to nationally agreed priorities. In that regard, we have seen commendable progress in Burundi and Sierra Leone. In the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau, the PBC's efforts in the coordination and mobilization of support to address specific challenges, such as security sector reform, are promising.

National leadership and ownership are of paramount importance in any peacebuilding endeavour. The national authorities must take primary responsibility for re-establishing the key institutions for security, governance and economic recovery, with the support of the United Nations and international partners. It is therefore important for the PBC to prioritize its engagement with countries on its agenda, building on existing national strategies and capacities.

We are encouraged by the initiatives for flexibility and the responsive funding being undertaken through the Peacebuilding Fund and the launching of its country-level multi-donor trust funds. We look forward to operationalization of the Fund's revised terms of reference to facilitate expeditious funding of peacebuilding activities.

The Peacebuilding Commission also needs to strengthen its monitoring and review of mutual commitments of national and international actors. The forthcoming 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions will provide an opportunity to take stock of its work and to focus on how to further

enhance its effectiveness in fulfilling its role and mandate.

Mr. Urbina (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to begin by thanking Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz for presenting the third annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2009/444) and to congratulate him and to thank him for his work as Chair of the Commission.

The United Nations has learned and accepted that the prevention of resurgence of armed conflict means early work on peacebuilding and continuing the work on consolidating the peace beyond the implementation of any agreements that put an end to conflict. The Peacebuilding Commission is the tangible expression of that conviction. The international community now realizes that peace cannot be achieved merely by ending an armed conflict but that it requires a painstaking and complex construct to support development and create conditions for lasting peace. That is now construed as the creative coexistence of a human community in harmony with its natural and political environment.

The Peacebuilding Commission has also learned to quickly provide the strategic and comprehensive support needed by countries to build peace and has shown itself to be a dynamic, innovative and flexible body, able to adapt to the various requirements arising in the countries on its agenda. Here, we commend the leadership and dedication of the chairs of the country-specific configurations — the former Permanent Representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador Frank Majoor; the Permanent Representatives of Sweden and Switzerland, Ambassadors Anders Linden and Peter Maurer; Ambassador John McNee, Permanent Representative of Canada; Ambassador Maria Luiza Ribeiro Viotti, Permanent Representative of Brazil; and Ambassador Jan Grauls, Permanent Representative of Belgium.

Over the last two years we have seen how the Security Council has increasingly taken in the peacebuilding perspective. Costa Rica welcomes the practice whereby the chairs of the configurations participate in debates on the respective national situations. The Council has also transformed the United Nations offices in the Central African Republic, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone into integrated peacebuilding offices. It has thus sought to act in a more comprehensive and strategic fashion for the entire United Nations system in those countries. We are sure that the success achieved will be a valuable stimulus to improve the work in that area and to strengthen the Council's relationship with the Peacebuilding Commission, especially with the respective country-specific configurations.

The revision of the Commission's mandate will be a valuable opportunity to evaluate results, to consider the lessons learned and to strengthen the Commission's work and its relation with other organs and agencies of the United Nations system.

Peacebuilding will no longer be the last thing to be considered in preparing for an exit or for closure of peacekeeping operations. It is, and must continue to be, a central axis for all United Nations actions, included from the earliest stages of all peace operations. Soon the Peacebuilding Commission will have valuable experience of which the Council must take advantage in drawing up and renewing mandates for peace missions that it authorizes. The Secretariat also bears a responsibility to recommend, from the very earliest stages of peace operations, the inclusion of recommendations on peacebuilding actions in its reports.

Costa Rica enthusiastically welcomes the idea of strengthening United Nations capacities in peacebuilding by establishing and consolidating a team of competent civilian experts able to deploy rapidly to support tasks such as, inter alia, security sector reform, institutional strengthening and support for judicial systems. Here, we support the endeavours to broaden and deepen the body of experts and civilian volunteers for peacebuilding, and we concur that it is necessary to pay particular attention to capturing and mobilizing greater capacity from developing countries, particularly women.

National actors must be both the engine and the drivers of peacebuilding processes in their own countries. Hence, the role of the international community must be one of support, not of protagonist. All peacebuilding efforts must have as a goal the construction and enhancement of national capacities to ensure sustainable peace once the international presence decreases in those countries that have lived through armed conflicts. Costa Rica considers it vital to involve civil society, including the private sector, to generate and promote ideas and changes in their communities.

Lastly, we wish to express once again our support for the Commission's endeavours to construct and enhance alliances and partnerships among donors, institutions, regional and subregional organizations and civil society to support peacebuilding processes. Certainly those partnerships contribute to ensuring more consistent and strategic participation of the international community.

Mr. Apakan (Turkey): Since we discussed the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2009/444) at length in the General Assembly last Friday, I will confine my intervention to a few points. But before doing so, I would like to thank Ambassador Muñoz for his briefing and to underscore the fact that the progress achieved in the Commission's work during the past four years is very positive and promising. Our thanks also go to the chairs of the country-specific configurations. It is clearly seen from the report that that relatively new instrument, with a growing track record, plays an essential role in helping the countries in need to attain a durable peace.

Yet the increased complexity of the post-conflict reconstruction processes, the evolving priorities of peacebuilding and the need to adapt to changing conditions on the ground call for a continuous review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture on the basis of the lessons learned.

With that in mind, we are pleased to see that the Commission has already engaged in a process of consultations on how to better improve its work, increase its impact and mobilize sustained international attention. We are also pleased that the new terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund are in place.

We believe that these ongoing processes will be further advanced with the envisaged review in 2010 of the Commission's founding resolutions. In this regard, I would like to emphasize five key issues for further consideration within the review process.

First, bearing in mind the importance of national ownership of the peacebuilding process, priority should be given to the issue of building national capacities. Our aim should be to transfer expertise rather than to create dependence on it.

Secondly, we should think more about the strategic planning of a coherent and effective transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, as well as about the identification of critical early peacebuilding tasks, particularly within the first two years. As pointed out in the thematic debate held under our presidency of the Council last June (see S/PV.6152), peacekeeping and peacebuilding are integral parts of a whole, and success can come only if we treat them as such. Turkey will actively pursue all efforts in that direction.

Thirdly, the gender perspective should be an essential element in the work of the Commission. The important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and the need for their empowerment in peacebuilding efforts should be stressed more within the work of the Commission.

Fourthly, the efficient functioning of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture rests on its ability of to deliver as one. Therefore, the harmonization of policies and procedures among the different arms of the United Nations emerges as a vital component for the success of our efforts. In this regard, the capacity of the Peacebuilding Support Office should be strengthened with a view to promoting a more integrated and strategic United Nations response in post-conflict countries.

Last but not least, we believe that the financing mechanism in support of peacebuilding efforts should be more predictable, sustainable, transparent, accountable and flexible. That is why Turkey stands fully behind its commitments to the Peacebuilding Fund and makes its contributions to it without any caveat. The Fund indeed has the potential to fill a unique niche in the post-conflict arena, and we hope that the revised terms of reference will allow the Fund to improve its efficiency and responsiveness.

The momentum the Commission has gathered in terms of advancing the peacebuilding agenda within the United Nations and its success in promoting a convergence of views among Member States constitutes its most important added value. We believe that the upcoming mandate review in 2010, based on lessons learned, will be useful in charting the course of the Commission's future work. Turkey is ready to actively contribute to this process by sharing with the members of the Commission and the Secretariat the experiences it has gained through its rather extensive involvement in and support to the recovery efforts of various post-conflict countries.

Finally, I fully agree with Ambassador Takasu and others who have argued for a closer working relationship between the Security Council and the

PBC. Regular meetings between the Presidents of the two bodies and increased mutual feedback on each other's work will certainly be useful in creating synergy in our efforts and effectiveness of our common endeavours.

The President: I will now make a statement in my national capacity.

Austria too would like to express its thanks to His Excellency Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz for introducing the third annual report (S/2009/444) on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We are grateful for the hard work undertaken and the excellent leadership provided by Ambassador Muñoz in the PBC. We also thank all PBC member States and the Chairs of the country-specific configurations for their work and for their collective efforts in preparing this report.

Austria associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union later in this meeting.

Effectively profiting from the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of a conflict is a crucial investment for long-term peace and stability. Peacebuilding perspectives must be taken into account from the very first day after the cessation of a conflict, and peacebuilding efforts must go hand in hand with the possible deployment of peacekeeping missions.

The importance of bringing peacekeeping and peacebuilding closer together has also become evident to us in our work as a member of the country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission for Sierra Leone. We also felt that the development there of an Integrated Peacebuilding Office is a very interesting and important model, and we therefore welcome the fact that the Security Council has already mandated other integrated peacebuilding offices.

We believe that it is evident that the work of the Peacebuilding Commission has a very important security dimension, especially when it deals with areas such as security sector reform or the destabilizing effects of drug trafficking and many other areas that have to do with stability issues and involvement in the country. For all those reasons, we believe that peacebuilding is an area that requires a constructive and forward-looking dialogue between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Austria welcomes the crucial role of the Peacebuilding Commission in addressing a country's post-conflict needs by promoting a coherent and integrated approach highlighting the principles of national ownership and regional cooperation. The Peacebuilding Commission provides valuable support for long-term democratic consolidation and sustained economic development. It is therefore best placed to develop a well coordinated, international consensus on peacebuilding and to bridge the gap between early stabilization and recovery efforts and long-term development planning.

In our view, it is essential to pay particular attention to two aspects: first, the transition, as I already said, between peacekeeping and peacebuilding; and secondly, the interface between peacebuilding and long-term cooperation for sustainable development. The successful negotiation of both elements is key to the ultimate success of an international engagement.

In our view, the Peacebuilding Commission is an extremely important forum to ensure this, along with the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office. The PBC, in accordance with its mandate, should advise on the interface between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. This would facilitate timely consideration by the international community of the longer-term perspectives on international engagements, including in the socio-economic area.

Well-functioning State institutions and rule of law in a post-conflict context are prerequisites for sustainable and long-term development. We are convinced that successful peacebuilding can take place only if all relevant actors are included. We welcome the PBC's efforts to strengthen its linkages within the United Nations system as well as with other national, regional and international actors, the private sector and civil society.

We attach great importance to building further on the Commission's accomplishments and look forward to its further development, as well as that of its working methods, in the context of the 2010 review. The review must be carried out in an inclusive way, with the participation of the entire United Nations membership, to ensure broader ownership of the process. Moreover, it should aim at strengthening the interaction between the Security Council and the PBC and increase the close coordination with the Peacebuilding Support Office on all peacebuilding efforts.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): I thank the Security Council for the invitation to participate in this debate in my capacity as Chair of the Guinea-Bissau configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

The report of the PBC on its third session (S/2009/444) presents a detailed appraisal of the activities undertaken by the Commission in the period under consideration. It is encouraging to note that much progress has been achieved since the Commission was established. The same applies to the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), which has been instrumental in providing catalytic funding to post-conflict countries.

In this connection, I would like to commend the Chair of the Organizational Committee, Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, for his dedicated efforts to enhance the role and visibility of the Commission. Our gratitude also goes to the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned.

The developments highlighted in the annual report are most welcome. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, we have been able to address the priorities established in the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding adopted last year, despite the tragic assassinations of March and June and the many challenges ahead. We are now engaged in the process of reviewing the Framework, which will result in conclusions and recommendations on the way forward in the next year.

Since I was appointed chair of the country-specific meeting, I have visited Bissau five times on different occasions and circumstances. In all of my visits, I have been able to witness the importance attached to the Commission and the commitment of Guinean authorities to the peacebuilding process. The successful conclusion of the presidential elections and the inauguration of a new Government represent a golden window of opportunity for peace and stability, around which we should focus our activities. Guinea-Bissau is a rich country, endowed with abundant natural resources, and needs our continuous support to fulfil its potential.

This debate on the PBC is timely, taking place as we consider the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) and begin a discussion on the 2010 review process. A number of recommendations have been made. It is now up to us to see how best they can contribute to strengthening the United Nations capacity to deal with peacebuilding challenges in a coherent, expedient and cost-effective manner. Based on our experience with the Guinea-Bissau configuration, we appreciate the importance of enhancing coordination among different actors on the ground, strong leadership teams and rapid and flexible funding instruments. Those are valid guidelines to address the challenges facing countries emerging from conflict.

The question of funding is key. We all know how difficult it is to ensure adequate levels of financial assistance under the uncertainties usually associated to post-conflict scenarios. We therefore praise the work of the Peacebuilding Fund, which has been able to delivery catalytic assistance in priority areas. Its new terms of reference will allow for more flexible and rapid disbursements, in close synergy with the Peacebuilding Commission. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, an initial allocation of PBF funding focused on four priority areas identified by the Government. It is my hope that a second tranche will be announced soon after we finalized the review of the Strategic Framework. We are aware that the PBF is not supposed to address all peacebuilding issues. However, we expect that its catalytic role in providing seed money to fund priority peacebuilding activities can show the way in attracting supplementary resources to allow such activities to be scaled up.

A successful peacebuilding strategy should also rely on coordination, bringing together all actors, including the international financial institutions and United Nations agencies, funds and programs on the ground in order to maximize synergies. By the same token, cooperation with regional organizations is indispensable, given the transnational nature of many peacebuilding challenges. The consultations with the African Union during the recent PBC mission to Addis Ababa highlighted the importance of closer and more frequent interactions with an institution that plays an important role in peacebuilding in Africa. I also found that the visit I paid to the headquarters of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in Abuja on 11 November was very useful in strengthening coordination between our work and the

work of ECOWAS on matters of common concern regarding peacebuilding in Guinea-Bissau.

Finally, it goes without saying that a strong United Nations presence on the ground is sine qua non for shortening the gap between New York and the country concerned, enhancing coordination and assisting the Government. In Guinea-Bissau, we welcome the decision to upgrade the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau into an integrated Office and hope it will enjoy positive consideration in the Fifth Committee so that it can start its operations at full capacity as soon as possible.

We hope that the experience of the PBC in its various configurations can inform the beginning of an open, transparent and comprehensive review process in 2010. The PBC is yet to reach its full potential, as outlined in its founding resolutions. It is now time to heed the lessons learned and allow the PBC to grow, consolidate its position at the centre of the peacebuilding architecture, and make a difference in the lives of millions of people in war-torn societies.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Mr. Lidén (Sweden): I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the European Union. Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

This year, Member States and United Nations system have taken important steps to strengthen international support to countries emerging from conflict. We have had debates in this chamber and in the General Assembly on the matter. Concrete initiatives are under way to enhance the coherence and effectiveness of our engagement.

Ending violence is merely the first step in building peace. Weak State institutions, broken economic systems and a lack of trust and confidence between former adversaries remain potent threats to stability long after a peace agreement has been signed. The challenge is to ensure basic security while starting the long process of building sustainable peace. This requires a comprehensive and coordinated response from the international community in support of national efforts.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is mandated to promote coordination, marshal resources and advise based on integrated strategies for peacebuilding. It was created as a forum for policy coordination at the strategic level among key international actors, including the international financial institutions. The Commission can play a central role in addressing critical gaps in peacebuilding efforts and contribute to increased coherence among security, development and humanitarian actors. Experience shows that the PBC can also be an important framework for mutual accountability, under which host Governments and the international community can be held to account against agreed commitments. The unique membership of the Commission provides international legitimacy to deliver effectively on these roles.

The 2010 review provides an important opportunity to reinvigorate the vision behind the PBC, inject renewed political attention and generate a common understanding on the way forward. In the review process, we should build on our experiences from the PBC's first years of operation. We know that support to post-conflict countries must build on national ownership and be context specific. The PBC should therefore be flexible in its engagement, focusing on a limited set of priorities and building on existing strategies and capacities at the country level. We also know that high level commitment and ownership by the PBC membership is central. We must ensure that our words and policies correspond with our actions in countries on the PBC agenda and in relevant multilateral organizations.

The European Union would welcome a more structured relationship, including increased interaction, between the PBC and the Security Council. This would promote the early inclusion of peacebuilding perspectives in Security Council considerations and decisions. We need to ensure better use of synergies between peacebuilding and peacekeeping, from mandating and planning to deploying and carrying out peace support operations.

The processes of reviewing the peacebuilding architecture and the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations should be undertaken in tandem. The recommendations in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) and the non-paper "A New Partnership Agenda: Charting a New Horizon for United Nations

Peacekeeping" highlight these linkages. Further efforts are needed to implement the integrated mission concept for more strategic and coherent United Nations support to peacebuilding. United Nations leadership in-country needs to be empowered to corral international support behind early and prioritized strategies. The operational capacity in core peacebuilding sectors must be strengthened, including through improved and timely deployment of civilian capacities. The European Union will continue to engage actively in taking these recommendations forward.

As we approach the tenth anniversary of adoption of resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security, urgent action must be taken to implement this agreement. More resources are needed to advance gender equality within transitional recovery, reintegration and reconstruction efforts. Efforts in countries emerging from conflict can offer opportunities to redress gender inequities of the past and set precedents for the future. Gender equality brings new degrees of democratic inclusiveness, as well as faster social recovery and more durable economic growth. The international community should enhance these opportunities.

It is the international community's moral obligation and responsibility to support countries emerging from conflict. We must not fail to meet this challenge. The United Nations, with its global legitimacy and broad range of tools, has a central role to play. We look to the Secretary-General for strong leadership in enhancing the coherence and effectiveness of the United Nation peace and security structures. The European Union will continue to actively support efforts to better assist countries in building sustainable peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): At the outset, I would like to commend the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Muñoz of Chile, for his strong and effective leadership and for his presentation today.

We now have three years of experience with the Peacebuilding Commission since the 2005 World Summit Outcome. The record so far leads us to several conclusions.

First, the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office are filling important gaps in the United Nations response to crisis and conflict. They are helping to prioritize and sequence tasks, identify overlooked areas of programming and funding and facilitate a more unified international presence in post-conflict countries.

Secondly, institutional progress has been made. The Peacebuilding Commission has provided useful support to the countries on its agenda, reformed its working methods and developed a pragmatic and strategic approach.

Thirdly, in our view, it is time to be more ambitious. The Commission's agenda can and should be expanded, and its impact should be greater at the earliest and most tenuous stages of post-conflict recovery. That is precisely when the international community's concentrated attention and resources can play their most critical role in consolidating peace.

The past year has shown signs of promise in several areas. Canada particularly welcomes growing cooperation between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. In my capacity as Chair of the Sierra Leone configuration, I have had the honour of regularly briefing the Security Council on peacebuilding progress in that country. In my most recent briefing, I noted that the PBC's engagement with Sierra Leone has evolved. In June, the Sierra Leone configuration aligned itself behind the Government's national strategy, the Agenda for Change, and also endorsed the new joint peacebuilding approach developed by the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone and the United Nations country team. That streamlined approach specifically prioritizes the issues identified by Sierra Leone as major risks to peace consolidation and economic growth, such as good governance, drug trafficking and youth unemployment. At the same time, the configuration has also advocated for support to Sierra Leone on critical issues highlighted by the occurrence of political instability in March, notably deepening democratic dialogue and enhancing police capacity. That is one example of how the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission can work together to achieve more coordinated and integrated peacebuilding in the field.

Another positive outcome is the development of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). This process demonstrated the value of institutional cooperation on important policy questions.

The PBC has a diverse membership, a unique mandate to work at the nexus of security and development, and growing links to other international institutions. It can serve as a useful forum for input into Security Council deliberations. The Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission should consider better defining and implementing this advisory role.

Finally, the PBC itself has made great strides. All of the country-specific configurations have taken significant steps to align their engagement with national priorities, adapt to changing circumstances on the ground and reduce administrative burdens. The tools of engagement are being modified and refined. A more flexible and strategic Peacebuilding Commission is gradually emerging, one that is better prepared to fulfil its political mandate and identify opportunities to add value to existing efforts.

Today's debate takes place as Member States prepare to embark on the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. In our view, the review should begin by taking stock and consulting widely with post-conflict States and all relevant peacebuilding partners. At the same time, it will be important at the end of the process to retain the Peacebuilding Commission's current flexibility and adaptability.

With that in mind, Canada would like to propose three issues for discussion in the review.

(*spoke in French*)

First, the Peacebuilding Commission should be prepared to vary the intensity and nature of its engagement depending on the circumstances in a country and stage of post-conflict recovery. To do that, modifications to working methods and tools of engagement may be required. Closer cooperation at the United Nations itself with the Security Council, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council will also be required.

Secondly, the Peacebuilding Commission should consider adopting a multi-tiered agenda to accommodate the need for different kinds of approaches. Indeed, not all countries emerging from conflict will require or want the level of engagement that includes the creation of a full country-specific configuration. In such case, the Commission's role may be limited to monitoring progress in peacebuilding or providing more targeted support.

Thirdly, as the recent report of the Secretary-General (S/2009/444) demonstrates, the Commission must pay greater attention to thematic issues and lessons learned. It must focus more on the policy dilemmas, strategic challenges and operational difficulties that peacebuilding presents. That includes the central question of knowing how to manage the transition from peacekeeping and humanitarian action to early recovery and development. Similarly, the Peacebuilding Support Office should become a focal point for peacebuilding expertise, particularly by drawing more regularly on the knowledge and experience of peacebuilding actors outside the United Nations.

The creation of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture was part of a broader recognition within the international community of the need to improve support for States recovering from conflict. In this respect, the Peacebuilding Commission has made progress and holds great potential. It is time to turn potential into reality and to address the remaining challenges. The 2010 review is thus a critical opportunity to realize the full ambition of the original vision articulated four years ago.

It is our view that, if we wish to assist the people of States emerging from conflict and working to build a more peaceful and prosperous future, that is the least we can do.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of El Salvador.

Mrs. Gallardo Hernández (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): We should like to express our gratitude to the delegation of Austria for convening this meeting to consider the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2009/444).

El Salvador has been committed to the cause of peacebuilding since the Commission was created, as we believe that the contribution of countries, like ours, that have themselves overcome armed conflicts is critical to building the capacity to identify the causes of violence, share experiences and implement, with the

agreement of national authorities, comprehensive peacebuilding strategies within the framework of the Commission.

Our statement today complements my delegation's expression of its position on this matter in the General Assembly on 20 November. We reiterate our gratitude for the leadership shown by Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz at the helm of the Commission, and we also welcome the support given by the Chairs of the country-specific configurations.

The report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/2009/304) is, in our view, an extremely important contribution for the entire United Nations system, inasmuch as it places the responsibility for peacebuilding on the shoulders of national authorities along with the international community, which also has a decisive role in the implementation of a common strategic goal. Likewise, the third report of the Peacebuilding Commission, which is the subject of our meeting today, takes a new approach, thanks to the experience accumulated by the Peacebuilding Commission and the countries on its agenda, to important issues, such as relations among the principle organs of the Organization, increased public awareness and the visibility that the Commission should have, which includes coordination with the funds and programs of the United Nations system and with international financial institutions and regional organizations and subregional banks.

In this context our recent visit to the African Union headquarters in Addis Ababa with the Chair of the Commission and other Commission members gave us an opportunity to consider how important it is to enhance communication, dialogue and coordination between the Commission and regional organizations, because they are the main actors and they know the reality and the culture on the ground, so as to give effect to the Commission's commitment to prevent the recurrence of violence in those countries.

I would also like to indicate that the Commission's report refers to the fact that the Working Group on Lessons Learned has touched on some important matters. Membership in that Group has given us the opportunity, along with other countries, to examine issues of importance to the countries under consideration, such as the role of the United Nations in establishing the rule of law and regional approaches to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, as in the Great Lakes region of Africa. The Working Group has also focused on national capacity-building in the aftermath of conflict, including the coordination between the Commission and regional and subregional organizations, sustainable integration and the need to set up permanent forums for dialogue among different sectors to promote genuine national reconciliation.

My country has had the privilege of chairing this Group since it was established, and we firmly believe that the work done holds added value for the work of the Commission. It has become an open arena wherein Member States, together with civil society and the academic world, have been able to come together to share a vision, which has contributed not just to enhancing the presence of the Commission in various post-conflict countries but also to enhancing the visibility of the Commission's activities. On the eve of the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission, my delegation would like to suggest that the members of the Security Council consider allowing the Working Group in Lessons Learned to continue and become an institution.

The experience garnered as a member of the Commission leads us to indicate how important it is for there to be greater coherence among the various subsidiary bodies when it comes to their respective mandates, so that strategic planning among the various entities responsible for post-conflict peacekeeping and peacebuilding demonstrate a shared vision and integrated mechanisms.

That leads us to propose a more rational use of equipment and goods employed by peacekeeping missions in the field, which could greatly benefit the country teams as they move into the peacebuilding phase. In other words, the capacities assigned to peacekeeping missions could be kept in place in the countries in which they operate — if needed, and in an appropriate way — such as to accelerate moving into the peacebuilding phase. We believe that there would be a reduction of the financial costs in both phases and that a synergy between the teams would be created. We must not forget that this would make it possible to enhance the response capacity of national institutions and regional organizations, together with the Commission, when the national priorities are defined in the phases of reconstruction, rehabilitation, institutional capacity-building, respect for human rights and international humanitarian law and others.

These thoughts come to us from considering how important it is to improve and strengthen the steering function and the coordination and coherence that must exist among the various organs and subsidiary bodies to achieve a fuller realization of the goals of the Peacebuilding Commission in the field.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate El Salvador's firm commitment to continue to play an active part in United Nations endeavours to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security as well as to the 2010 review process of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, Mr. President, I would like to thank you for organizing this annual debate. Its importance is even greater, given the five-year review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2010. I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the Chair of the Commission, Ambassador Muñoz, and the new Assistant Secretary-General, Ms. Cheng-Hopkins, two people whose vision and tireless efforts are very much appreciated. Belgium fully aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union (EU), which sums up the starting point of the EU's contribution to the United Nations five-year review of the architecture of the Commission.

As Chair of the Central African Republic configuration I often have an opportunity to remind my listeners that the Commission must report to two bodies, the General Assembly and the Security Council. I am in front of one of them right now. Moreover, the thematic nature of the Commission makes it a natural interlocutor for the Economic and Social Council.

Last week, during the debate in the General Assembly on the reports we are discussing here today, I had the opportunity to present the principles that will guide the efforts of Belgium in the context of the five-year review process: first, to draw on the vision which in 2005 was the basis for the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission; secondly, the evolving and dynamic nature of the efforts of the Peacebuilding Commission; and, thirdly, the need to view the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission in the context of the overall picture, taking into account in particular the developments over the past years in the other areas of United Nations reform.

Today, I should like to take these thoughts a little further by focusing on the relationship between the Commission and the Security Council. In recent years, the Council has shown growing interest in peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflicts. This is a welcome development. Both within the Council and beyond, there is broad consensus on the purpose of the Peacebuilding Commission: the task of filling the institutional void that arises during post-conflict transition by giving attention to security, development, good governance and the rule of law. Successive presidential statements of the Council have mentioned the role that the Peacebuilding Commission should play in various contexts, such as addressing problems relating to gender, children and armed conflict, conflict mediation and resolution, and the role of regional and subregional organizations in the maintenance of international peace and security. We have taken these areas fully into account in the Central African Republic country-specific configuration.

However, relations between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission should be better articulated and further intensified despite the already frequent participation of Chairs of country-specific configurations in Council debates. In this connection, the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict states that:

> "The Security Council should consider more proactively how the advice of the Commission could contribute to its work during the early phase of the Council's consideration of post-conflict situations, for example, by providing an integrated peacebuilding perspective and specific suggestions for the Council's own engagement with the country on its agenda". (*S/2009/304, para. 82*)

Following this report, the Council asked the Commission, inter alia, to make more room on its agenda for its advisory role. We believe it is important, in the context of the five-year review, to consider and to specify in greater detail the modalities of the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

I should like to speak of the links between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Council in the various stages of United Nations and international

responses to post-conflict periods: start-up, follow-up and the gradual withdrawal of the international presence.

First of all, I shall concentrate on start-up. As stressed in the report of the Secretary-General, once the main conflict has ended, many critical peacebuilding activities are only beginning. The Peacebuilding Commission is well placed to act as a point of contact for the various stakeholders involved in putting together the international response. At the request of the Security Council, the Commission could make recommendations to the various stakeholders and consider the immediate needs that a United Nations presence would have to meet. United Nations missions in countries on the agenda should be equipped with mandates and tools sufficient to effectively assist the efforts of the Peacebuilding Commission on the ground. Recent efforts to transition towards integrated missions and mandates that incorporate support for the Peacebuilding Commission, as in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic, are aimed at responding to precisely this need.

In the follow-up period after the initial phase, the role of the Peacebuilding Commission should include the monitoring of progress, coordination and advice. Here the Secretary-General's report states that the establishment of national peacebuilding and reconstruction frameworks should lay the groundwork for a follow-up mechanism which international and national partners could draw upon. In this context, the Peacebuilding Commission would have the role of strengthening the reciprocity of commitments and coordinating the monitoring and evaluation of progress made. So that this process may be oriented more towards partners of the Commission, in particular the Security Council, we will need to strike the right balance between benchmarks that are too detailed and objectives that are too general. There is no doubt that it would be worthwhile for the Council itself to endeavour to define what its needs are in this area, as the delegation of Japan has just suggested.

In the countries on its agenda, the Peacebuilding Commission can strengthen the legitimacy and coherence of the activities of the various units of the United Nations system and other stakeholders involved. This task of coordinating the efforts of the international community is a difficult one but it is indispensable for making international support both more predictable and more flexible.

With regard to its advisory role, the Commission could be involved to a greater degree by the Security Council in the preparation of Council documents relating to countries on the Commission's agenda. In the same vein, the Commission could participate in the consideration of and follow-up on cross-cutting issues relevant to its work, such as issues relating to children and armed conflict or to sexual violence. To that end, more significant collaboration between the relevant working groups of the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission should be developed.

Finally, I shall address the gradual withdrawal of the United Nations presence. The last phase that the Peacebuilding Commission should help to plan and implement is the withdrawal of the United Nations presence. We should bear in mind that a premature or ill-conceived withdrawal can in very quickly destroy the foundations of development that it took many years to build. That is why the best strategy for exiting a post-conflict country is to strengthen its national capacities while gradually removing international assistance. The Peacebuilding Commission is the foremost advocate of rapid development of national capacities.

In conclusion, it would, without a doubt, be useful for the Peacebuilding Commission, the Secretariat and the Security Council to engage in a dialogue on strategies and instruments for the prevention of conflicts, since, as we have long known, preventing violent conflicts is far preferable to, as well as much less costly than, curing their aftermath.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): We appreciate the timely scheduling of today's debate on the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2009/444). Let me begin by placing on record our appreciation of the good work being done by Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Chair of the Commission, who brings a wealth of experience to this assignment, the new Chairs of the country-specific configurations and the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned. I also wish to congratulate Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins on her appointment as the head of the Peacebuilding Support Office. My delegation will remain constructively engaged in the process and assures them our fullest cooperation and support.

The report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) rightly acknowledges the imperatives of national ownership and of anchoring peacebuilding efforts at the country level. Equally significant is the fact that the Peacebuilding Commission is trying to cooperate and coordinate with other United Nations agencies as well as other international institutions and is trying to expand the web of stakeholders as well as their involvement in the peacebuilding process.

As a contributor to the Peacebuilding Fund and as a member of the Peacebuilding Commission, India has remained actively engaged in the critical task of peacebuilding. We will continue our active association with both the Commission and the Fund with a view to enabling those institutions to fulfil in their entirety the tasks assigned to them by the General Assembly and the Security Council. India has always held the view that the setting up of the Peacebuilding Commission filled an important institutional gap and that the Commission can and should make an important contribution to the recovery, reconstruction and development of countries emerging from conflict, wherever it agrees to act upon a request for advice and assistance by any such Member State.

It was with this conviction that India has been proactively engaged in revising the terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund and sponsored General Assembly draft resolution A/64/L.72 in that regard in May. We are happy to note that the Secretary-General's annual report on the Peacebuilding Fund observes that its revised terms of reference have enabled the Fund "to serve as a fast-disbursing, agile, responsive and risk-taking peacebuilding instrument" (*S/2009/419, para. 55*). In all our endeavours, it is important that the relationship with the Peacebuilding Commission and all donors be managed creatively, so as to utilize synergies in existing peacebuilding strategies.

In its own unique experience of nation-building, India has developed multifaceted capacities relevant to peacebuilding and development. We have shared this experience and expertise in a number of countries transiting from conflict to peace. We are very happy to continue to make our capabilities in nation-building available to countries in post-conflict situations, and to cooperate with the United Nations in its peacebuilding activities, including those in the areas of development, social sector reform, and the rule of law and security.

Let me conclude by stressing two important imperatives. First, we must always strive to ensure that there is an effective two-way dialogue at all stages between the Peacebuilding Commission and the countries on its agenda. Secondly, we need to constantly improve the governance structures of the peacebuilding architecture. It should be in a position to respond swiftly and with greater efficiency so that all available resources geared towards peacebuilding in post-conflict situations are properly harnessed in the shortest possible time.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Finland.

Ms. Schroderus-Fox (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

The Nordic countries attach great importance to peacebuilding. The entire international community has a responsibility to support post-conflict countries in recovering and establishing foundations for sustainable peace and development. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was established to ensure that the efforts of the international community to assist post-conflict countries are carried out in an integrated and effective manner.

The Nordic countries are strong supporters of the Peacebuilding Commission. It has a special role in promoting a coordinated and coherent approach to peacebuilding. During the past three years the PBC has demonstrated the ability to develop innovative means of engagement. While those beginnings show promise, the ultimate yardstick of success must be change on the ground. We must be willing to take a frank look at the record so far and make adjustments where needed. The 2010 review will be a good opportunity to improve the Commission's impact. Such a stocktaking exercise will help us create more momentum for peacebuilding and generate a common view on the way forward.

The Peacebuilding Commission is mandated to bring together all relevant actors and to act as a forum for strategic policy coordination. It should therefore contribute to coherence between the political mandate given by the Security Council and the development and humanitarian mandates of United Nations agencies. However, this is not a concern for the PBC alone; we, the Member States, should also have coherent peacebuilding policies and maintain a consistent approach in our activities.

Mediation, peacekeeping and peacebuilding focus on different dimensions of post-conflict needs. In this context I especially want to highlight the link between peacebuilding and peacekeeping. The ongoing process of reviewing United Nations peacekeeping and the upcoming review of the peacebuilding architecture provide a unique opportunity to make better use of synergies between these two areas. Furthermore, in order to deliver on the Commission's mandated advisory role, enhancing its relationship with the Security Council would be highly beneficial.

Ensuring national ownership of peacebuilding efforts from the very beginning is essential. Only national actors can identify the most pressing needs of their society and the most effective ways of addressing them. Each post-conflict situation is unique; there is no one-size-fits-all solution. The Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific strategic frameworks should not impose an additional layer of planning, but should rather be flexible instruments of engagement that build on existing assessments and strategies. Such shared responsibility is reflected in the principle of mutual accountability. The PBC urges national as well as international actors to commit to peacebuilding efforts and encourages a review of these commitments. We support the further development of this principle, especially through enhanced resource-mapping and measurement of donor pledges against actual disbursements.

The international community has to create a space for a truly inclusive national process and undertake all peacebuilding in a way that strengthens the capacity and commitment of local institutions. Priority-setting, planning and implementation need to be genuinely shared responsibilities. The extensive participation of civil society, private sector and community-level local actors in the peacebuilding and reconstruction process is essential. This applies especially to women. Real reconciliation and rebuilding happens at the local level, and women are often the best experts in identifying the most crucial needs of their communities. Their experience, knowledge and determination are very much needed. Yet women are still too often left out of peace negotiations and post-conflict planning processes. We must address this. The Nordic countries therefore welcome the recent adoption of resolution 1889 (2009). It takes steps towards ensuring sufficient funding for women's needs in post-conflict situations and addressing the participation of women in post-conflict planning. These important steps reemphasize the message of resolution 1325 (2000): A woman's place is not in the margins, but in the centre of decision-making forums.

To conclude, let me warmly congratulate Assistant Secretary-General Judy Cheng-Hopkins on her appointment as the head of the Peacebuilding Support Office. A strong Support Office has a key role in bringing the United Nations system together on peacebuilding. At the same time, we welcome the strong leadership of the Secretary-General in advancing peacebuilding. I guarantee that the Nordic countries will remain a committed partner in making the Peacebuilding Commission and the United Nations peacebuilding architecture a success.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mr. Maurer (Switzerland): Thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to address the Council today. Like others, I would like to thank Ambassador Muñoz for his well-informed and well-crafted report, contained in document S/2009/444.

Switzerland's experience in peacebuilding and our recent experience as Chair of the country-specific configuration on Burundi of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) leads me to make the following points.

First, the principle of mutual accountability, as substantiated in the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi and its biannual reviews and similar documents, has proven to be a most useful tool for responsible partnership. In our view, such a partnership implies not only mutual understanding on objectives, priorities and means to achieve them, but also a commitment to seek solutions through constructive cooperation. That goes for the relationship between the country on the agenda and the international community, as well as for the national actors themselves. National ownership in peacebuilding is essential, but national ownership, in our understanding, cannot be the exclusive prerogative of the Government alone.

Second, we see much merit in our close relationship with the actors on the ground. Our actions are guided by the principle of subsidiarity between the Commission and those actors. It is not in New York

that our efforts will bear the best fruit. Peace is built on the ground.

Third, in every peacebuilding process, elections are a crucial phase. Several elections are planned in the next months, including in Burundi. Elections raise two particular challenges. One is the challenge to support — and adequately fund — the electoral process. The other is to balance the inherent tensions of electoral competition with a basic understanding and willingness between the parties to cooperate in order to stabilize societies.

In post-conflict situations particularly, elections should not become winner-take-all events. Rather, they are essential for democratizing the peace process and building national ownership for peace. It is thus important for all political parties to have access to the political space at hand, which is a key element in ensuring a sincere and sustained dialogue. The Peacebuilding Commission, along with the Council, have a role to play in getting this message across.

Fourth, one of the tasks of the Peacebuilding Commission is to provide advice to the Council. In that regard, I would like to recall and support the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), like other speakers have done before me, namely, first, to consider more proactively the potential contributions of the Commission, and second, to foster the complementarity between the Security Council and the Commission.

Like troop-contributing countries, members of the Commission and its country-specific configurations should be involved as early as possible in the Council's deliberations on countries on the PBC agenda.

Fifth, we have to share more systematically experiences and lessons learned. While all peacebuilding situations are unique, in most of them the same key issues need to be addressed, such as security sector reform, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, job creation, return and reintegration of displaced persons and the future of restless young people.

Six, aware that peace cannot be achieved unless all efforts concur to that end, the United Nations peacebuilding architecture was created for the purpose of overcoming institutional barriers between humanitarian, development, peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities. Those challenges remain. We still act too often in institutional silos within the United Nations, competing for scarce human and financial resources. We must increase efforts to build bridges.

Seventh, as an all-stakeholder forum, the Commission is well qualified to identify gaps, overcome blockages, muster resources and focus the spotlight of international attention on the process of peacebuilding. It has done well for the four countries on its agenda. However, we all know that there are more than those four situations where societies are struggling to avoid falling into armed conflict or trying to escape from it.

We should ask ourselves these two questions: are we doing all we can do to make the best use of the United Nations peacebuilding instruments where peace can be built? And are those tools fit to be applied to all situations where peace is to be built?

Finally, the 2010 review of the peacebuilding architecture is a good opportunity to take stock and reflect on ways to foster its potential in the new prevailing international environment. There are numerous initiatives under way, and we welcome them all. Nevertheless, we also believe that there is merit in conducting a more structured and inclusive dialogue between all stakeholders, and that the review process deserves authoritative guidance.

We therefore call upon the Secretary-General to present, by the end of April 2010, a forward-looking report with specific recommendations. Such a report could take stock of challenges to peace, it could highlight the complementarity of mediation and conflict prevention, peacekeeping, operational activities for development for peacebuilding and it could also reflect on the reform processes in those fields.

A report by the Secretary-General would provide a sound basis for adopting a new consensus on the Peacebuilding Commission at the highest political level at the high-level plenary meeting in September 2010. One or two high-level personalities could, following the model established with the Prodi report on the relationship between the United Nations and the African Union, give stature and authority to that kind of response and thus facilitate a clearer focus for our debate.

The President: I call now on the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Momen (Bangladesh): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. We commend Ambassador Muñoz, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, for introducing the third annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), contained in document S/2009/444, before the Council this morning.

We also express our sincere appreciation to the Permanent Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Switzerland and El Salvador for their good work in chairing the respective country-specific configurations and in gathering the lessons learned.

We welcome the report of the Peacebuilding Commission, which reflects the activities of the Commission for the period from 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009. We commend the Commission's work. The Peacebuilding Commission is the central intergovernmental advisory body that, along with the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office, fills an important gap in the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

We are encouraged to see that the PBC has continued to combine and deepen its linkage to the three principal organs of the United Nations — the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. We also appreciate the Commission's continued efforts towards expanding partnerships with different national, regional and international actors, including United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, as well as international financial institutions, regional organizations, the private sector and civil society.

My delegation would like to reiterate its principled position on the following issues.

First, the Peacebuilding Commission should have the central role in post-conflict peacebuilding and reconciliation processes. Secondly, post-conflict societies must take charge of their own destiny, that is, the Commission's work should be based on national ownership and national priorities. Thirdly, a more rapid and flexible funding mechanism is necessary for effective peacebuilding efforts. Finally, women's involvement and empowerment, in all stages, is a critical element for any successful peacebuilding endeavour.

We welcome the revised terms of references of the Peacebuilding Fund. My delegation is particularly pleased to see the more flexible and responsive nature of the Fund, including the role it plays in the context of those terms of reference for the Commission in advising the Secretary-General on the selection of countries eligible for consideration for funding.

We commend the Secretary-Generals' efforts in producing a comprehensive report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of the conflict, contained in document S/2009/304. We are encouraged to see the Commission's advisory role in shaping the report, including incorporation of views of the Member States, which, in effect, makes it more comprehensive and inclusive.

The challenges that post-conflict countries face in the immediate aftermath of conflict — defined as the first two years after the main conflict in a country has ended — cannot be overstated. We could not agree more with the Secretary-General when he articulates the following in his report: the need for strengthening national ownership of the peacebuilding process and capacity development from the outset; the necessity of rationalizing the capacity of the United Nations system to provide knowledge, expertise and deployable personnel to meet the most urgent peacebuilding needs together with partners who have a comparative advantage in particular areas; and the need for working with Member States to enhance the speed, alignment, flexibility and risk-tolerance of funding mechanisms.

In the context of comparative advantage in particular areas, my delegation would like to highlight the fact that, being one of the major troop-contributing countries for more than two decades and currently the largest police-contributing country, Bangladesh is uniquely positioned to assist in identifying and drawing on the most relevant capacity requirements on the ground in post-conflict countries. For example, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and security sector reform are recognized as two key elements in the peacebuilding process. However, those two elements are also included in the mandates of peacekeeping missions. Thus, any experience gained and lessons learned in peacekeeping operations could significantly assist and complement the Peacebuilding Commission's work. In this regard,

we would like to recall the penultimate paragraph of the Security Council's presidential statement of 5 August 2009 (S/PRST/2009/24), which underscores the importance of introducing peacebuilding elements in peacekeeping operations before a transfer to the Peacebuilding Commission, which, in reality, is yet to be translated into reality in any country-specific context. My delegation therefore emphasizes the need for strong synergy between peacekeeping and peacebuilding mandates.

We further take note of the Secretary-General's recommendation to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts with a view to strengthening United Nations capacities concerning peacebuilding activities on the ground. In this regard, my delegation is willing to engage in Commission's future work, as outlined in paragraph 86 of the third report, aiming to analyse how the United Nations and the international community can help to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts and volunteers for peacebuilding, giving particular attention to mobilizing more capacities from developing countries, especially women.

In line with Security Council resolution 1889 (2009), we strongly emphasize the need for the full, equal and effective participation of women at all stages of peacebuilding. We further underscore the key role women can play in re-establishing the fabric of a recovering society by contributing to the reintegration of ex-combatants into the family, including post-conflict reconstruction activities. We would also like to highlight the need for women's involvement in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies in order to take their perspectives and needs into account in the peacebuilding process. My delegation looks forward to becoming engaged in the future debate concerning women's participation and inclusion in peacebuilding and planning in the aftermath of conflict.

We further recognize that civil society and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can significantly contribute to the process of achieving sustainable economic growth leading to lasting peace and development in post-conflict countries. Bangladesh, home to world's largest non-governmental organization and microcredit enterprises, is best placed to offer to share best practices with regard to the role of NGOs, in partnership with the public authorities, in nation-building endeavours. We would further like to refer to our post-liberation experiences, where we have developed and learned the importance of domestic initiatives such as microcredit to address poverty through, inter alia, capacity-building, self-employment and women's empowerment.

In this context, I am happy to note that a leading non-governmental organization based in Bangladesh — BRAC, which is the largest NGO in Bangladesh and probably in the world in terms of its population coverage, with its wide-ranging operations in poverty alleviation, empowerment of the poor, health, education including non-formal education, community development, agriculture and microfinance development projects — has recently begun to help residents of Kroo Bay and other communities in Sierra Leone and, inter alia, in other countries in Africa.

Countries emerging from conflicts need to consolidate democracy as a step forward; at times they require national identification cards to help the Government and the election commission to prepare non-controversial, transparent and accurate voter lists. Bangladesh has the experience and expertise in issuing nearly 90 million national identification cards and preparing voter lists in recent years and we stand ready to share our knowledge and capability with post-conflict countries.

The 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions will provide a good opportunity to take stock of achievements and remaining challenges, including charting the future role of the Commission in support of an expanding United Nations peacebuilding agenda and enhancing its support to countries emerging from conflict. We look forward to working in close collaboration with all in that regard.

In conclusion, may I say that Bangladesh's commitment to peace and security in post-conflict countries has a deeply rooted emotional basis. Given that Bangladeshi peacekeepers, while serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations in those countries, often under very difficult situations, were able to establish strong bonding with ordinary people, thus gaining their confidence and, more important, their hearts. We would not and cannot therefore shy away from any efforts which aim at ensuring the overall well-being of the people of post-conflict societies.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-kook (Republic of Korea): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing today's debate on the third annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2009/444) and giving us this opportunity to address the Security Council.

As was articulated by many voices during the General Assembly debate on this subject last week, the third session of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was a rewarding period. During its session, the Commission focused on, and showed notable progress in, the areas of enhancing global awareness of peacebuilding activities, mobilizing resources and developing strategies to coordinate the rule of law in post-conflict countries. However, we also faced a series of challenges during this period, most notably the global financial crisis, food security issues and political turmoil in certain agenda countries. How to harness the progress we made and how to tackle those challenges will be subjects that require our close attention during the upcoming 2010 review process.

The Peacebuilding Commission is a subsidiary body of the General Assembly and the Security Council. For the Commission to function and carry out its mandate effectively, close linkage with, and strong political support from, the Security Council is fundamental. In turn, the lessons learned and the experiences that the Commission has accumulated in the field will provide valuable advisory inputs for the Security Council's discussions. I appreciate the support that the Security Council has shown to the Commission to date, but at the same time I would also like to echo the view expressed during the General Assembly debate last week that the Commission is still underutilized considering the potential it has shown. I would like to share my observations as Vice-Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission regarding enhancing the linkage between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council.

First, peacekeeping missions need to further embody early peacebuilding elements in their mandates and operations, considering that one of key elements of success in peacekeeping activities is to deliver peace dividends and bring about immediate and tangible impacts on the ground.

On early peacebuilding, the PBC has its own unique added value to contribute, and it would be advisable to arrange for the Commission to provide its input to discussions on peacekeeping missions from the earliest stages. I understand that this issue has been raised in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) and by the Secretariat non-paper on the New Horizon project, and I look forward to more detailed and concrete proposals and discussions on this subject.

Secondly, a systematic way for the Security Council to utilize the assets of the four country-specific meetings of the PBC could be developed. The accumulated lessons learned and experience of each country-specific meeting will bring a valuable perspective to the discussion in the Security Council of a concerned country on the agenda of the PBC. However, as was stated by Member States during the General Assembly debate, country-specific meetings, which are the main vehicles of the PBC, are underutilized. I see possible areas where synergy could be created when the assets of the country-specific meetings are efficiently incorporated into the discussions of the Security Council, and hope that more modalities are developed to enhance the interactivity of the country-specific meetings and the Security Council.

Thirdly, it is time to think of increasing the number of countries on the agenda of the PBC so that the lessons learned and experience of the Commission can be shared more broadly and applied more comprehensively. The country-specific meetings are an instrumental and effective mechanism allowing the PBC to reach out to and intensely engage with countries emerging from conflict. I believe that the value of the country-specific meetings has been quite well proven over the past three years. At the same time, we should also consider the Commission's limited capacity to engage multiple countries simultaneously, and develop new and innovative working methods.

Fourthly, as various players participate in peacebuilding activities, the importance of an integrated approach cannot be emphasized enough. An increasing number of integrated peacebuilding offices in the field represents a compelling reason to deliver as one in the field. The catalytic role of the PBC can be instrumental in this process, and in this regard, I hope that the Commission can more actively participate in discussions on the operations of integrated peacebuilding offices.

Finally, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and sustainable development should be pursued seamlessly and with a holistic approach. Overarching strategies integrating all of these dimensions need to be developed from the first stage of peacekeeping, and thus the linkage between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is again emphasized here. Separately developed strategies will not work as efficiently to harness synergy and increase the possibility of success on the ground as those developed holistically. In the same vein, I believe that entry and exit strategies are no exception to this.

Close linkage between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is crucial in carrying out our peacebuilding mandates and helping countries to meet the dramatically increasing number of post-conflict demands in the field. The challenges identified over the Commission's past three years of operation only reinforce the importance and critical value of this linkage. When the relationship between the two bodies is further strengthened, we will be better poised to meet the challenges on the ground.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 2.05 p.m.